

THE RISE OF SAINT BARTHOLOMEW'S CULT IN ARMENIA FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURIES

Michel van Esbroeck

Bollandist Fathers (Belgium)

Between the seventh and thirteenth centuries, a most remarkable phenomenon, provoking our reflection on Armenian history and society, is the introduction of a new claim to Apostolocity within the Armenian Church. The name of the apostle Bartholomew had first been introduced into Armenian historiography at the beginning of the seventh century. The last vestige of the legend is to be found in the thirteenth century in the History of Siwnik by Step'anos Ōrbelian.

The story of the cult of Bartholomew in Armenia is riddled by a puzzling placename: Urbanopolis of Great Armenia.¹ That name appears everywhere in the Armenian sources as the place where the apostle died and was buried. It was first mentioned, however, as is often the case, in the History of Movsēs Xorenac'i. This work is once again at the center of the problem. We will not discuss here the age of Movsēs's History, but we will show that his source, in the passage where he quotes the apostles Bartholomew and Jude, is a Greek one from the seventh or eighth century. Whether that passage may be considered as an interpolation is another question which would require separate treatment.

Various hypotheses were proposed by J. Markwart and R. Lipsius to explain Urbanopolis, but without convincing arguments. The most recent legend, it is true, declares ingenuously that Urbanopolis is no other than Aḡbak² at the sources of the Tigris. But the ruins of the convent of Saint Bartholomew of Aḡbak are from the thirteenth century,³ and an earlier legend on the apostle does not mention Aḡbak at all.⁴

T. Samuelian & M. Stone, eds. Medieval Armenian Culture. (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6). Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983. pp. 161 to 178.

Our purpose in the present paper is to demonstrate that "Urbanopolis of Great Armenia" is a Greek designation for Nikopolis of Pontus, and that all the various legends of Bartholomew can be easily explained and understood if the Latin and Parthian legends of Bartholomew were originally located in Nikopolis of Pontus.

The first step will be to show how perfectly the expression "Great Armenia" fits the Greek sources at the end of the sixth century in reference to a place name in the region of Nikopolis; the second step will be to give evidence from a Georgian source which clearly writes "Urbanopolis" as a second name for Nikopolis; the third point will be to demonstrate that Movsēs's History depends on the Greek Lists of the Apostles, where Bartholomew's name is found in Armenia only in the seventh century.

In another part of our argument, we will show how the southern house of the Ēštuni dynasty enhanced the cult of Bartholomew, with the oldest Armenian legend in the eighth century, and how it became central to the conflicts with the Byzantine Church during the reign of Maurice. Finally, we will say a few words about the last group of legends in Siwnik, and their revision of the older traditions.

In their oldest historical accounts, the Armenian historians omitted Bartholomew. P'awstos and Agat'angelos do not say a word about Bartholomew. However P'awstos, in his prologue, gives an exact report of the works of other writers who spoke about the events "from the time of Thaddeus's preaching until the death of Gregory, from the martyrdom of that apostle to the reception of the faith."⁵ Movsēs Xorenac'i, or his interpolator, adds the following words: "However, the apostle Bartholomew, who brought his life to a close in the town of Arebanos (var. Aresbanos, Arbanos, Arevbanos) received Armenia also in his apostolic field." As to Simon who received Persia as his own field, I cannot tell precisely what he has done, nor where he died, even if some people say that a certain Simon died in Veriosphor (var. Veriophora, Veriophober, Verin Sophor, Verios Phor). I do not know if it is true that that was his reason for his coming in this region, but I mentioned it merely to make you aware that I did not spare any effort to give you any possible tradition."⁶

Those are the words of Movsēs. They fit perfectly if he had before him the Greek Lists of the Apostles, which appeared at the end of the sixth century. The form in -os indicates already the probability of a Greek original. There we find that the apostle Jude died in the Bosphorus, which

is certainly to be connected with Veriosphor. Movsēs's hesitation about Simon can easily be understood by looking at the complex reports of the various Lists of the Apostles.

Let us read some of them. The Breviarium Apostolorum, attested already c. 600 A.D., writes: "Iudas qui interpretatur confessor, Iacobi frater, in Mesopotamiam praedicavit: sepultus est in Nerito Armeniae urbe,"⁷ But that Jude is already somewhat confused with Simon the Zealot, whose feast day is the same, and whose name appears immediately before that of Judas. Judas is listed as the successor to James the Just in Jerusalem, and the notice concludes: "Post annos CXX meruit sub Adriano per crucem sustinere martyrii passionem. Iacet in Porto foro (var. Porro foro, porto photo)."⁸ The list of the pseudo-Hippolytus sends Jude to Edessa, and has him buried en Beryto, which is the key to Nerito. That entry gives evidence of a confusion between Jude and Addeus/Thaddeus, which in turn makes the paradoxal "Nerito in Armenia" of the Latin tradition understandable.⁹

Finally, a third List of Apostles, this one Anonymous, gives Simon the Zealot of Cana in Galilea (thus identified with Nathanael), as having died en Bospero tes Iberias, that is, in the Crimea.¹⁰ The destination of his mission field was reinforced in the ninth century by the Greek monk Epiphanius.¹¹

If Movsēs had before him the Lists of the Apostles, with entries of both Bartholomew and Jude, then clearly he checked the two entries with the name "Armenia": Bartholomew in Urbanopolis from Great Armenia, and Simon the Zealot in a puzzling "Beyrouth of Armenia," already transformed into Veriosphorus and Bosphoros by assimilation with the other Jude. His hesitation stems from the fact that he did not recognize the place name. Latin Nerito from Beryto as a place in Armenia, and that he mentioned Simon and not Jude in the Bosphoros, rejecting the widespread assimilation of Simon-Jude. Note also that Movsēs tried to say everything he knew about apostolic traditions. His laconic mention of Urbanopolis shows how little he was able to present to his readers, having only the Greek lists before his eyes.

More recent historians do not say much more than Movsēs. Step'anos Asoḡik who writes his History up to 1004 gives the following brief account: "However the apostle Thomas [That is Jude-Thomas] received Armenia by lot, as well as Bartholomew who ended his life in our region in the town of Arabian."¹² Step'anos is native of Tarōn and writes for the house of the Bagratids just as Movsēs Xorenac'i does. Zenob of Glak, whose History is to

be placed in the tenth century, quotes a letter supposed to be from Leontios of Caesarea to Gregory the Illuminator. There we read: Thou wast chosen in the election place of the holy apostles Bartholomew and Thaddeus, remember their works."¹³ Pseudo-Zenob already places Bartholomew before Thaddeus, even if he writes in the Turuberan, at the convent of the Nine Sources.

As a matter of fact, in the beginning of the tenth century, the apostolic claim through Bartholomew is used by all the Catholicoi. The first one is Yovhannēs V Drasxanakertc'i, who cites Bartholomew before Thaddeus. Not long after, Anania Mokac'i (943-965) speaks in the same manner, and Xač'ik Anec'i (972-992) also includes both of the apostles in the title of the letter he sent to the metropolitan of Melitene Theodore.¹⁴

Other legendary accounts also speak about Bartholomew. The Letter of Movsēs, the Wise Rhetor, to Sahak Arcruni, about the founding of the convent of Hogeac' Vank' by the apostle Bartholomew, is from the end of the eleventh century, for it mentions the death of Atom, the son of Sennekerim.¹⁵ Moreover, that legend already implies the existence of the Armenian Passion of the Apostle, and of the Finding of his body in Barm, near Urbanopolis.

The oldest testimony about Bartholomew has come to us through Greek sources. It is the well-known Narratio de Rebus Armeniae, which was published and commented on by G. Garitte in 1952. The original, lost model was certainly written in Armenian. One paragraph of that chronicle directly concerns Saint Bartholomew:

In the time of Aršak, Armenia was divided; at that time Theodosiopolis was also founded. That place was originally called Kalè Archè. The great apostle Bartholomew, who went among the Parthians, baptized the cousin of the King of Persia, and with him 3000 people in the river Euphrates. In that place, he founded a church with the name of the holy Theotokos. A citadel having been erected, he called it Kalè Archè. Theodosius saw that the water was good at that spot, and he built a city there and changed its name to Theodosiopolis. To him was subordinated Aršak prince of Great Armenia; Xosrov, however, the king of Armenia, was subordinated to the king of Persia who reigned in the Armenian region.¹⁶

This is the first example of the title "Great Armenia" used for the

western part, while to the east, after the peace of Jovian, which was so favorable to the Persians, Xosrov is said to only reign over "Armenia." The Parthian legend referred to by the Chronicle exists in Latin, Greek and Armenian, but is still unedited in the two later versions.¹⁷ Those texts never speak about Urbanopolis. The tradition of the founding of a church devoted to the holy Theotokos has two parallels in the East. In the legend of Hogeac' Vank', Bartholomew, after having driven out the devs, built the church of the Virgin and brought there the Icon of Our Lady which he received at the moment of the Dormition of the Virgin. And in the History of Siwnik Step'anos Ōrbelian says how the church of the Presentation of the Virgin was erected by Bartholomew in the district of Gołtn just at the frontier of Arevik'. This is the last account in the thirteenth century.¹⁸

Let us look first at the role of Saint Bartholomew on the western frontier. The Parthian legend of Bartholomew was analyzed by von Gutschmid. He showed that the Pontus region is the proper context for the legend. The king Polemon II, client of Rome, converted to Judaism and married Berenikē, the widow of Herod of Chalkis. Polemon reigned from 54 A.D. and ended his career in Cilicia in 74.¹⁹ Nikopolis was the most important city of the old kingdom of Pontus. It received its Greek name when Pompey in 66 B.C. was victorious over Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus, who took refuge in the kingdom of Tigran, his brother-in-law.²⁰ Nikopolis was included in the "Little Armenia" while eleven other cities of Pontus were assigned to the province of Bithynia. Strabo says, about 25 A.D., that Nikopolis was an important city near the Lykos in Armenia which is not to be confused with the Lykos in Cilicia, the Lycaonia mentioned in a more recent legend, as the mission field of Bartholomew, together with Philip and Mariamne.²¹

At that time, "Lesser Armenia" was under Roman rule, while Great Armenia was ruled by Tigran with its capital in Tigranocerta, today Mayafarīqīn.²² About 34 B.C. Anthony succeeded in capturing the Tigran's son, Artavazd III; therefore he first attacked Nikopolis.²³ In 54 A.D., the Hasmonian Jew Aristobulos was made governor of Lesser Armenia, that is Nikopolis and Satala, in northwest Cappadocia.²⁴ At that moment, the future Theodosiopolis was under the rule of the Arsacid Trdat, the brother of the Parthian king. This is exactly the context which fits the Narratio de retus Armeniae and the Parthian Passion.²⁵

In 63, Trdat was king of Armenia under Roman protection. Under

Hadrian's rule, the imperial province Armenia minor receives a garrison in Satala.²⁶ At the same time, in East Armenia, we find the inscription Aurelios Pacorus basileus megalis Armenias.²⁷ When Diocletian restored the Roman hegemony in Armenia, the Laterculus of Verona, in 297, records the military presence with the designation Armenia minor nunc et maior addita.²⁸ And in 387, Ammianus Marcellinus only knows one Armenia minor in which Melitene is included, but in which Satala and Nikopolis are to be added, for Epiphanius speaks of Sebastia as a town of Pontus, the so-called Lesser Armenia.²⁹

A new division appears in 386. An edict of Theodosius places Ariarathos and Comana in Armenia secunda.³⁰ In 457, in the answers sent by the bishops to the questions of emperor Leo, we find an Armenia prima with Nikopolis, Sebaste, Sebastopolis, Koloneia, Dazina and Satala, and an Armenia secunda with Melitene, Arca and Arabissos.³¹ That division dates from 384. The same division appears in the Synekdemosis of Hierokles in 527-528.³² Thus from 384 to 527-528, there is no question of Western Great Armenia.

From Justinian himself, there is a law dated 528, where the expression Great Armenia is used:

Elegimus certasque provincias, id est magnam Armeniam quae interior dicebatur, et gentes, et primam et secundum Armeniam, et Pontum Polemoniacum tuae curae commisimus comite Armeniae penitus sublato.³³

In 536, another text of Justinian makes it clear that the part of Great Armenia which was known as inner Armenia is the region of Bazanis, previously Leontopolis, and subsequently Justinianopolis. The fourfold division of Justinian includes following cities:³⁴ Armenia 1a: Theodosiopolis, Baberd, Satala, Nicopolis, Trebizond and Karasunt. Armenia 2a: Sebaste, Comana and Zela. Armenia 3a: Melitene, Arca, Arabissos, Cucusa, Comana Chryse. Armenia 4a: Martyropolis and the five satrapies which were named gentes in 528, that is Sophene, Anzitene, Balabitenne, Ashtianene and Sophanene.

Nikopolis was thus separated from Sebaste and was a part of eastern Greek Armenia. What must be examined is whether the expression Greater Inner Armenia for Theodosiopolis and Bazanis means that the first Armenia is in reality the whole Great Armenia. In 553, this is explicitly done in the subscription of the bishops to the Acts of the Council: there is one Gregorius

misericordiae Dei episcopus Iustinianopolitanorum civitatis Magnae Armeniae provinciae. In 681, we find the Greek equivalent Ioustinianopoleos tes megales Armeniae, and Coloniae civitatis magnae Armeniae provinciae³⁵, and last but not least, in the subscription of the Council in Trullo, 691 A.D., we find "Photios chariti Theou episkopos tes Nikopoliton philochristou poleos tes megales ton Armenion eparchias."³⁶

Procopius the historian uses the same terminology when he writes the Peri Ktismaton between 553 and 555.³⁷ The demonstration of this point would require too much space. It is thus absolutely clear that 536 onwards, Nikopolis could be referred to as Nikopolis of Great Armenia.

Of course Nikopolis has another name before Pompey's conquest. The Georgian calendar of John Zosime, written in the tenth century, has for July 10: "The feast of the 40 martyrs who suffered martyrdom in the town Urban of Armenia."³⁸ The date shows beyond doubt that the group is identical with the well known Greek martyrdom of the 40 martyrs of Nikopolis.

There is thus no difficulty in explaining the appearance (in Greek sources from 600 A.D.), of an entry about Bartholomew being murdered in Urbanopolis of Great Armenia. That entry made its way into the History of Movsēs Xorenac'i among other apostolic fields of Simon-Jude. The hypothesis of Markwart: Arewân in Syria, or of Lipsius Ervandashat in central Armenia, are pure phonetical guesses.³⁹

One should note that Bartholomew was promoted to the role of palladium or symbol of divine protection for the East limes from the time of Theodosius I to that of Justinian. An accurate study of various sources—The Armenian Chronicle (published by G. Garitte). Malalas, Procopius and Theodorus Anagnostes—which cannot be presented here in detail, reveals the following facts. Theodosius I (379-395) built two towns called by his name, one in the North, and the other in the South, in accordance with a bilateral agreement with the Persians to leave the 300 km which separated the two citadels free of any fortification.⁴⁰ The Theodosiopolis in the North claimed the favor of the apostle Bartholomew.

Between 506 and 509, Emperor Anastasius (491-518) also built a town in the South, Dara, and Theodorus Anagnostes tells us that Anastasius received a vision of Bartholomew who instructed him to put his relics in the new fortress which was rebaptised Anastasiopolis.⁴¹ But Anastasius rebuilt, on the same site, the old citadel of Theodosiopolis, which had opened its door to the enemy in 502, and gave the citadel the name Anastasiopolis.

Lastly, emperor Justinian (527-565) built many citadels, but in the North he made a new Justinianopolis from the old Bazanis, the Armenian Baŝean, and he also gave his name to Martyropolis in the South. There is no report about Bartholomew in the sources of Justinian's reign,⁴² but the Armenian Finding of the relics of Bartholomew is placed at the time of Marutha in Martyropolis,⁴³ which is certainly a more recent construction. Marutha's time is in the beginning of the fifth century.

The matter of the relics of Bartholomew in Dara is well known. In 573, on November 11 or 15, Dara was captured by Xosru Anushirvan.⁴⁴ An anonymous Syriac chronicle from 724 describes the catastrophe as follows:

In the year 824, Xosru came against Dara with his troops and captured it. He sent the marzpan Adharmahan who reached Antioch, burned Amos and the church of Saint Julian. . . .When he came back to his Shah, he took Dara, made the population prisoner, the emptied town, and introduced a new Persian population.⁴⁵

The echo of the catastrophe was so great that it was alluded to by Gregory of Tours in the fourth book of his Historia Francorum, before 593.⁴⁶ The first real opponent to the Persian winners was the future emperor Maurice. In the summer 578, the emperor Tiberius transported all the Christians of the region of Martyropolis, 10,090 people, to the island of Cyprus.⁴⁷

In Cyprus the feast of Saint Bartholomew had been associated with that of their own apostle Barnabas. But a dozen years later, the bishop Agathon of Lipari, alerted by a revelation, discovered the relics of Saint Bartholomew which were contained in lead coffins.⁴⁸ The new relics then made their way to the West, first to Benevento then to Rome and to other places. At the same time, the eastern and southern part of Armenia made a new claim to apostolicity.

There are two general causes that provoked the Armenians to claim the new apostolicity. One is purely political, the other is essentially religious.

From 908 onwards, the house of Arcrunis became kings of Vaspurakan, and T'ovma Arcruni wrote the History of Armenia from the viewpoint of the new dynasty. In 925, the Catholicos Yovhannēs V Drasxanakertc'i takes refuge in the Joroc' Vank', in Vaspurakan under king Gagik's protection. The three successors of Yovhannēs were Ṛštuni princes, and before his death in 936, Gagik built the splendid cathedral of Aḫ'tamar for T'ēodoros Ṛštuni. The

legend of Hogeac' Vank' is addressed to the successors of Gagik. There are four legends about Bartholomew in Armenia. (1) the Finding of the relics by Marutha in Urbanopolis at a place named Barm and their deposit in Martyropolis, (2) the Armenian Passion under Sanatruk, (3) the legend of Bartholomew and Jude which is the source of Step'anos Ōrbelian, and (4) the legend of the founding of Hogeac' Vank' in Aṭbak. They are all located in the bounds of the house of Vaspurakan, with a slight excursion into Siwnik, in Her, Goṭn and Zarewand.

In the history of the numerous apostolicities claimed by various churches from east to west, no better explanation has been given than that which Yovhannēs V proposed himself. Let us first follow his argumentation; afterwards we will analyze how deeply his reasoning was rooted in the beginning of the eighth century.

The program of Yovhannēs V is apparent from the very beginning of his History. He wishes to explain how, at the time of Vataršak of the house of T'orgom,

the establishment of the holy Christian faith spread all over the earth, and above all among the Armenian people, thanks to Bartholomew, who is one of the twelve, and Thaddeus who is one of the seventy, who received by lot of Our Lord Jesus Christ the responsibility for evangelizing and spreading the doctrine in our Land.⁴⁹

In order to substantiate his thesis, Yovhannēs could have followed Movsēs Xorenac'i's History. Movsēs attributes the division of the four Armenias to the eponymous hero Aram, and adds: "What some people say about Greek Armenia does not appeal to me. Let the others work in their own way!"⁵⁰ Yovhannēs quotes manifestly from Movsēs, but instead of the four figures, he explains further:

The so-called Armenia as far as the boundary with Pontus was named first Armenia; from the Pontos to the frontiers of the town of Melitene second Armenia; from Melitene to the frontiers of Sophene, third Armenia; and from Sophene to Martyropolis and the land of Alcnik in the west, fourth Armenia. The fourth one extended its territory to the frontier of Armenia itself. But its own natural and sovereign territory was called Great Armenia.⁵¹

The fundamental divergence from Movsēs touches directly the Great Armenia

near Martyropolis. That interpretation is obviously contrary to the Greek sources we mentioned first.

Yovhannēs's motives are clearer when he speaks about Maurice.

The emperor Maurice arrogantly changed the names of the land which had been fixed by Aram. . . He named fourth Armenia the land whose capital is Martyropolis, that is Np'rkert or Justinianopolis, and he inscribed all those definitions in the archives of the kingdom. And consequently, he named the land of Karin, whose capital is Theodosiopolis, part of great Armenia. . . . Having changed everything in that way, he inscribed this in the archives of the kingdom. I write this to you, in order to escape the accusation of ignorance about what I said first on the first, second, third and fourth Armenia, while the first designation is from our valiant Aram, the second, however, is from Maurice the emperor of the Greeks.⁵²

This paragraph is most interesting. We already saw that the division attributed to Maurice is in fact that of Justinian. Yovhannēs, however, makes explicit the reasons which were alluded to by Movsēs Xorenac'i. He adds, moreover, the name of Great Armenia to the region of Theodosiopolis. One should remember that from 604 to 610, there was a brief period during which the legend of Agat'angelos was interpreted with a local seat in that region under Yovhannēs Bagaranec'i's pastoral rule.⁵³ This could be an additional reason for rejecting Maurice's division of Armenia. On the other hand, one cannot understand why Pontus was called part of Great Armenia after Maurice's victories, if it had not already been considered part of Great Armenia before, as we saw in the subscriptions of the bishops.

To return to the argumentation of Yovhannēs V. In the seventeenth year of Trdat's reign, Saint Gregory the Illuminator was enthroned on the see of the holy apostles Bartholomew and Thaddeus.⁵⁴ We will see that the Finding of the relics of Bartholomew on the Roman limes is intended to introduce one of the twelve apostles in the real Great Armenia, and the reasons which led the Catholicos to make this new claim of apostolicity are quite clear.

In relating the pontificate of Nersēs the Great, Yovhannēs tells us of his reception of the pontificate (hayrapetut'iwn) in Caesarea, and the success of his evangelization under Pap's reign. He adds:

Not long before, Constans, the son of Constantine the Great,

transferred the precious relics of Saint John the evangelist from Ephesus to Constantinople.⁵⁵ For the same reason, Jerusalem became bold and attributed to itself the rank of patriarchate, justifying this by the fact that the Word of the Father had been born there, was seen and lived among human people, was baptized by John, crucified, buried, and resurrected the third day. Until that time, there were only four patriarchates on earth, corresponding to the four evangelists. Matthew in Antioch, Mark in Alexandria, Luke in Rome and John in Ephesus. But now, there were in fact six. Therefore our King Aršak and the naxarars of Armenia were also emboldened, and they elevated to patriarchate of the house of T'orgom, the great Nersēs, citing as evidence the presence of our apostles Bartholomew and Thaddeus, who received from the Lord the mission to preach and to evangelize the region of Ashkenaz. Their precious relics are among us, and the living martyr Gregory obtained their See. When they thus achieved their aim, the number of the patriarchates stood at seven, and it continued as such for all eternity. Thus in our land, the primacy of ecclesiastical authority has its fulfillment with only nine hierarchical orders: the chiefs of archbishops in Iberia and Albania by whom the archbishops are ordained; in Sebaste they settled metropolitans as in Melitene and Martyropolis the bishops according to their functions ordained the priests, the deacons, the subdeacons, the lectors and the cantors. Thus everywhere in the majority of the Armenian churches they were harmoniously placed for the glory of God.⁵⁶

That theme is central for Yovhannēs V. He says in the same way speaking about Sahak:

They placed with him (Nersēs) on the throne Sahak, of the race of Albanos, an estimable man adorned with apostolic and religious qualities. He was not sent, according to previous tradition, to Caesarea, but putting aside the previous law, they ordained him according to the law of the patriarchs who receive their mission from the episcopal assembly, as it is in Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, Ephesus, Constantinople and Jerusalem, so that the autonomous patriarchate could not fall into the hands

of foreigners.⁵⁷

The role of Saint Bartholomew in the history of Yovhannēs VI Catholicos is quite central. The presence of one of the Twelve and note merely one of the seventy—that is, Thaddeus—is required for a theology of ecclesiastical hierarchy in the east. That theory, replaced by Yovhannēs V under the patriarch Nersēs the Great, serves as a justification of Armenian autonomy under Sahak's Patriarchate. According to that view, Yovhannēs modifies the translation made by Constans in 356, which in reality concerned Timothy and not John the Evangelist whose body was never found.⁵⁸ But he needed a precedent of acquiring the rank of patriarchate through the translation of the relics of one of the Twelve.

Was it, however, Yovhannēs V himself who first elaborated the whole theory? There is strong evidence that he is transmitting older reports and if we wish to discover at what time Bartholomew first figured in on Armenian legend implying that he died in Armenia itself, ancient testimonies must be sought. In fact the theory of the nine hierarchical orders can be traced to the beginning of the seventh century.

The argument concerning the four patriarchates and the nine orders of the church is set forth by Step'anos Ōrbelian (+1305) who quotes the three sources he uses. That is the History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movsēs Dasxuranc'i (tenth century), the History of the Secession of the Iberians by Uxtanēs of Edessa (tenth century), and the Epistle by the Catholicos Maštoc' (+896), Yovhannēs's predecessor. Those three sources are available, and the most complete is that of Maštoc', the spiritual master of Yovhannēs V. The letter of Maštoc' is an answer to a consultation of the Catholicos Gēorg (876–897) on the ecclesiastical rank of the primacy of Siwnik.⁵⁹ The demonstration of the association of the four patriarchates with the evangelists is found at the same time in the letter of Patriarch Photius to the Catholicos Zak'arias (+875).⁶⁰

Even if we do not know the real author of that letter, it explains the point of view of the Greeks, and it is noteworthy that it does not mention Bartholomew together with Thaddeus in the title of the address. The canons of Sirakavan which are appended to the letter of Photius testify that the Greeks did not succeed in persuading the Armenians. This is a good indication that the discussions are taking place between 862 and 875. On the other hand, the patriarch Ignatius of Constantinople, the adversary of Photius, makes use of the theory of the four evangelists in the presence of

the Roman apocrisiars. Yovhannēs V did not originate the apostolic claim of Constantinople, even if he adds the translation of the relics of John of Ephesus.

The controversy with the Byzantines was even older. Both Movsēs Daxuranc'i and the letter of Maštoc' used a document which unfortunately has disappeared: the letter addressed by Solomon Mak'enoc'ac'i circa 735 to the future patriarch Salomon (+791).⁶¹ That document was based on the discussions which set the Greeks and Yovhannēs Mayragomec'i in opposition at the Council of Karin in 632 under Esdras's Catholicossate. More than the Council of Chalcedon, as Nersēs Akinian wrote back in 1910, the constitution of the hierarchical church was the center of the discussion, already in the time of Catholicos Abraham in 610.⁶² Uxtanēs also underlines the apostolic pretention upon which the Greeks founded their theories at the time of Maurice. It is at that moment, he says, that the Albanians began to claim that their land was converted by the apostle Eliseus, disciple of James of Jerusalem.⁶³

If, before Yovhannēs Catholicos, there is no attempt to send the apostle Bartholomew to east Armenia, this is due to the fact that, on the Chalcedonian side, the apostle Bartholomew was already the symbol of a well-established and very old tradition, as we can read in the Narratio de Rebus Armeniae. The relics of Bartholomew were well-known to Anastasius when he built the church of Saint Bartholomew in Dara, where the relics were preserved until the catastrophe of 573. Note that some time after Kiwrion, it is a bishop named Bartholomew who is the head of the Iberian Chalcedonian Church.

This is the general context in which the appearance of the four Armenian legends of Bartholomew can be explained. The old Armenian Passion with the translation by Marutha are inserted in the Tonakan of Muš, the great parchment Ms. Matenadaran 7729.⁶⁴ After a long analysis of the whole repertoire of that prestigious collection, I think it very probable that Solomon Mak'enoc'ac'i introduced the two pieces into his collection, dated 747, according to the original title, which was recopied in 1200.

We suggest that on the east facade of the church of Aġt'amar the apostle pictured facing Elias, is not Thomas as was proposed by Sirarpie Der Nersessian, but Bartholomew.⁶⁵ The equation of the east facade has to be read in the following scheme: John the Baptist is to Gregory Illuminator what Elias is to Bartholomew for the founding of the Armenian church.

NOTES

¹For different realizations of that place name, see M. van Esbroeck, "Chronique Armenienne," Analecta Bollandiana, 80(1962) 425-428.

²K. Č'erakian, Ankanon girk' arak-elakank' (Venice, 1904) 358-364.

³J. M. Thierry, "Monastères arméniens du Vaspourakan III," REArm 6(1969) 162-180; Date proposed on pp. 178-179.

⁴Edited by Č'erakian, Ankanon Girk' 333-357. That text will be referred to as the Armenian Passion of Bartholomew.

⁵P'awstos Biwzandac'i, Patmut'iwn Hayoc', (Tiflis, 1912) 9-10.

⁶Movsēs Xorenac'i, Patmut'iwn Hayoc' (ed. M. Abeġian and S. Yarut'iwnian, Tiflis, 1913) II. 38 (p. 158); Cf. R. W. Thomson, Moses Khorenats'i. History of the Armenians (Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies 4; Cambridge: Harvard, 1978) 174-176.

⁷B. de Gaiffier, "Le 'Breviarium apostolorum,'" Analecta Bollandiana, 81(1963) 105. Th. Schermann, Prophetarum Vitae fabulosae, Leipzig (1907) 211.

⁸Th. Schermann, Prophetarum, 210-211.

⁹Ibid., 166.

¹⁰Ibid., 172.

¹¹Cf. Patrologia Graeca 120, col. 221.

¹²Step'anos Asotik, Patmut'iwn Tiezerakan (ed. S. Malxaseanc'; St. Petersburg, 1885) 46.

¹³Zenob Glak, Patmut'iwn Tarōnay, (Venice, 1889) 302.

¹⁴Girk' Tt'oc', Tiflis 1901, 302.

¹⁵Srboyn Hōrn Meroy Movsēsi Xorenac'woy Matenagrut'iwnk' (Venice, S. Lazzaro, 1865) 282-296.

¹⁶G. Garitte, La narratio de rebus Armeniae (Louvain, 1952) 382-395.

¹⁷Cf. M. Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, 2.1 (Leipzig, 1898) 128-150. The Greek text is a translation from the Latin model. For the unpublished Greek legend, see J. Noret, "Manuscripts grecs à Weimar," Analecta Bollandiana, 87(1969) 82, n. 12. The unpublished Armenian Parthian

legend is to be found in the codex Matenadaran 7853 (1366), ff. 374v-380r. I hope to publish soon the entire dossier of Bartholomew.

¹⁸Step'anos Ōrbelian, Patmut'iwn Nahangi Sisakan (Tiflis, 1911).

¹⁹W. Hoffman, "Polemon II," Pauly's Realencyclopädie, (Stuttgart, 1952), 22.2, col. 1285-1287.

²⁰J. van Ooteghem, Pompée le Grand: bâtisseur d'Empire, (Bruxelles, 1954), 209.

²¹J. Sturm, "Nikopolis" Pauly's Realencyclopädie (Stuttgart, 1936), sv. col. 536. For the Greek legend, see F. Halkin, Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca, Bruxelles, 1957, s.v.

²²R. Grousset, Histoire d'Arménie, (Paris, 1947) 87-89.

²³Sturm, "Nikopolis," col. 536.

²⁴R. Grousset, Histoire, 107.

²⁵On the Latin names of the Parthian Passion see von Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften (Leipzig, 1891) 2.351-52, who also recognized some persons as Polemon II of Pontus and Zenon Artaxias, and also some local divinities.

²⁶R. Grousset, Histoire, 111.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸O. Seeck, Notitia dignitatum (Berlin, 1876) 248.

²⁹Epiphanius of Cyprus, Panarion 75, 1, 5 (ed. K. Holl; Leipzig, 1933) 333; Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum libri, 19, 8, 12, and 20, 11, 4.

³⁰Codex Iustinianus recognovit P. Krueger (Berlin, 1912) 11, 48, p. 441.

³¹E. Kuhn, Die städtische und burgerliche Verfassung des Römischen Reichs bis auf die Zeiten Justinians, (Leipzig, 1865) 2.243-50.

³²E. Hönigmann, Le Synekdemois d'Hierokles (Bruxelles, 1939), 37.

³³Codex Iustinianus 1, 5. Cf. K. Güterbock, Römische Armenien und Römische Satrapien, (Königsberg, 1900) 40-51.

³⁴Justinian, novelle 31 (ed. Z. Lingenthal; Leipzig, 1881) 277.

³⁵Hardouin, Acta conciliorum et epistolae decretales 3(1714) col. 204,

1392 and 1434.

³⁶Ibid., col. 1705.

³⁷R. Rubin, "Prokopeios von Kaisareia," in Pauly's Realencyclopædie, (Stuttgart, 1957), 23.1 col. 574.

³⁸G. Garitte, Le calendrier palestinien georgien du Sinaiticus 34, (Brussels, 1958) 77 for July 10.

³⁹J. Markwart, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran, Leipzig 1905, p. 232-235. R. Lipsius, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, (Braunschweig, 1884). 2.2 p. 100.

⁴⁰Procopius of Caesarea, De Aedificiis (ed. J. Haury; Leipzig, 1913) 2, 1, 5 on p. 46. This probably is a condition derived from Theodosius I, not from Theodosius II. For the conditions 422, cf. E. Stein, Histoire du Bas-Empire, (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959) 1.281 and notes on p. 564. The war took place at Nisibis and Theodosiopolis to the North, because there were no other fortifications. However, B. Rubin, Das Zeitalter Justinians (Berlin, 1966) 256-257, appears to attribute this condition to Theodosius II in view of the peace of 442.

⁴¹The text is traced back to John Diakrinomenos in the most recent edition, Theodorus Anagnostes. Kirchengeschichte (ed. G. Ch. Hansen; Berlin, 1971) 157, 9-11.

⁴²Procopius of Caesarea, De Aedificiis, 2, 3, 4, on pp. 53-54, and 2, 3, 26.

⁴³see Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis 159, for the translation of the relics by Marutha.

⁴⁴Michael the Syrian, Chronique (ed. J. B. Chabot; Paris, 1901) 2. 312.

⁴⁵John of Ephesus, Histoire Ecclesiastique (ed. E. W. Brooks; Louvain, 1936) 3, 6, 6 on pp. 221-222; [text (Paris, 1935) 292-293]. Also Chronica minora (ed. I. Guidi; (Paris, 1903) p. 42 = text p. 145.

⁴⁶Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum (ed. W. Arendt, Monumenta Germaniae Historica; Hannover, 1885) 4, 4 on p. 174.

⁴⁷Theophylacte Simocatta, Historiae (ed. De Boor; Lipsiae, 1887) 143.

⁴⁸Gregorius I Papa, Registrum epistolarum (ed. P. Ewald and L.

Hartmann; Berlin, 1891) 3, 53 on p. 210 and letter II, 19; p. 116 and II, 51.

⁴⁹Patmut'iwn Yovhannu Kat'olikosi (Jerusalem, 1867) "Introduction," p. 8.

⁵⁰Movsēs Xorenac'i, 1.14 (Abeġian p. 47).

⁵¹Yovhannu Patmut'iwn, 24. [Trans. M. J. Saint-Martin; Paris, 1841 p. 12].

⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 88-89 [Saint-Martin, p. 57-58.]

⁵³M. van Esbroeck, "Un nouveau témoin de l'Agathange," REArm, (1971) 152-153.

⁵⁴Yovhannu Patmut'iwn, p. 51 [Saint-Martin, p. 32.]

⁵⁵This detail is obviously wrong since Constans did not find the body of John the Evangelist. However, the removal of Timothy's body from Ephesus as well as those of Andrew—one of the twelve—and of Luke the evangelist, made it difficult to desire to follow in the footsteps of Ephesus. Yovhannēs pleaded his own case by making the translation of John the basis of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He proceeded no differently in the case of the translation of Bartholomew whose original existence (on the Western border) he did not deny.

⁵⁶Yovhannu Patmut'iwn, 61-63 [Saint-Martin, 39-40.]

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 67-68 [Saint-Martin, 43].

⁵⁸U. H. Delehay, *Melanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine* (Bruxelles, 1966) 407-13.

⁵⁹Step'anos Ōrbelian, Histoire de la Siounie, (ed. M. Brosset; St. Petersburg, 1864) Ch. 25 on pp. 62-63 and Ch. 27 on p. 69. In Movsēs Dasxuranc'i, Ch. 48; Giulxandanian, "T'out' eraneloyñ Maštoc'i," Ararat 35 (1902) 748-749.

⁶⁰Girk T'htoc' (Tiflis, 1901) 279-281.

⁶¹M. van Esbroeck, "Salomon de Makhenots: vardapet of the eighth century," Armeniaca. Melanges d'Etudes Arméniennes (Venice, 1969) 40-41.

⁶²N. Akinian, Kiwriion Kat'olikos Vrac' (Vienna, 1910) 254.

⁶³Ukhtanes d'Edesse, in Deux historiens arméniens [Translated by M. Brosset; St. Petersburg, 1871] 343.

⁶⁴The structure of that manuscript was the subject of a paper delivered at the Conference on Linguistics in Yerevan in September 1982, to appear in the Acts of that Congress.

⁶⁵S. Der Nersessian, Aght'amar: Church of the Holy Cross, (Cambridge, Mass., 1965) 16 and Plate 33. It is possible that the apostle is not named so as to satisfy the ambivalence of Thomas-Bartholomew.